
REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Claims 1-15 are pending, of which claims 1 and 9 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. The amendments to claims 1 and 9 are fully supported by the specification at line 4 of paragraph [0017] on page 4. Therefore, it is believed that no new matter adds by way of amendments to claims 1 and 9. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1- 1 5 patently define over prior art of record and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 103

1. The Office Action rejected claims 1-13 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zurek et al. (US-6,636,750, hereinafter Zurek) and further in view of Marui et al. (US-5,367,556, hereinafter Marui).

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner stated that Zurek discloses a hands-free amplifier similar to the claimed hands-free amplifier except that Zurek is silent on a power source electrically connected to the substrate board inside the main body to provide electrical power for driving the substrate board. However, the Examiner relied upon Marui to disclose a battery pack (100). The Examiner interprets the outboard battery pack as reading on the claim since it is not part of the phone and provides power to the hands-free device via connectors T31-32, T21-22 and T11-12, as shown in Figure 1. Hence one skilled in the art would view the combined hands-free circuit and battery pack as one virtual device since the phone operates independently from them. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zurek, such that a battery source electrically connected to the substrate board inside the main body to provide electrical power for driving the substrate board, to provide means for powering the amplifier so it doesn't have to have its own cumbersome power source.

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, as amended, recites *a power source inside the main body, wherein the power source is electrically connected to the substrate board inside the main body to provide electrical*

power for driving the substrate board. The Office Action acknowledged that Zurek fails to teach such feature and relied on Marui to teach this feature.

However, Marui does not teach or even remotely suggest the above feature either. Clearly, the battery pack 100 of Marui is not located inside the main body of adapter 1. Marui teaches that battery pack 100 is detachably connected to the adapter 1 through a contact-type connector 300 (Col. 2, lines 54-55). But, Marui never teaches or suggests that the battery pack 100 is located inside the main body of adapter 1. Fig. 6 clearly shows that the battery pack 100 is attached to the radio telephone 200.

Furthermore, the battery pack 100 does not even function to supply power to the hand-free circuit 70 of the adapter 1. Marui, in FIG. 1, shows that the battery pack 100 is externally connected to the adapter 1 via T11-T12, T21-T22, T31-T32 so that the battery pack 100 can be charged by the externally mounted car battery 500 via main supply circuit section 30 of the adapter 1 depending upon the operating condition of the radio telephone 200. Throughout the patent, Marui clearly and unambiguously teaches that the purpose of connecting the battery pack 100 to adapter 1 is to charge the battery pack 100, not to drive the hand-free circuit 70. See Col. 2, line 67 to Col. 3, line 6; Col. 3, lines 55-57; Col. 4, line 36-38; Col. 6, lines 40 to Col. 7 line 31. Indeed, the battery pack 100 can only supply power to the radio telephone 200 and cannot drive the hand-free circuit. Marui substantially teaches that the power for driving the adapter 1 is supplied by the external car battery 500 via main power section 30 of the adapter 1 when the switch 11 is turned on (please see col. 5, lines 24-28).

The above discussed difference is technically significant. The advantage of having a built-in battery pack inside the hand-free amplifier is that at least the portability of the hand-free amplifier can be significantly enhanced and thereby providing greater convenience to the users.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Zurek and Marui. The amended independent Claim 9 also recites features similar to those recited by the amended Claim 1, therefore, the amended Claim 9 also patentably defines over Zurek and Marui for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 2-8, 10-13 and 15, directly or indirectly depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, and thus are also patentable over Zurek and Marui for at least the same reasons as that for claims 1 and 9. In addition, these dependent claims contain features that further distinguish over the

cited references. As independent claims 1 and 9 have been shown patentable over the cited references, there is no need to further discuss the patentability of the dependent claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

2. The Office Action rejected claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zurek and Marui as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Son et al. (US-6,212,408, hereinafter Son).

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection.

Even though the Examiner relied upon Son to disclose a voice control circuit, still Son cannot cure the specific deficiencies of Zurek and Marui discussed above. Therefore, claim 9 as well as its dependent claim 14 patently defines over Zurek, Marui and Son for at least the same reasons discussed above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the pending claims 1-15 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectively submitted

J.C. PATENTS

Date: 2/28/2005

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761


Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330